



THE STATE OF NEVADA

PERMIT TO CHANGE POINT OF DIVERSION, MANNER OF USE AND PLACE OF USE OF THE PUBLIC WATERS OF THE STATE OF NEVADA HERETOFORE APPROPRIATED

Name of applicant: UNITED STATES AS TRUSTEE FOR THE PYRAMID LAKE
PAIUTE TRIBE OF INDIANS, ACTING THROUGH THE BUREAU
OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND THE PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE
OF INDIANS

Source: TRUCKEE RIVER

Basin: PYRAMID LAKE VALLEY

Manner of Use: WILDLIFE

Period of Use: January 1st to December 31st

Priority Date: 12/08/1859

APPROVAL OF STATE ENGINEER

This is to certify that I have examined the foregoing application, and do hereby grant the same, subject to the following limitations and conditions:

This temporary permit, to change the place and manner of use of a portion of the waters of the Truckee River as heretofore granted under Claim 1, Truckee River Decree, is issued subject to the terms and conditions imposed in said decree and with the understanding that no other rights on the source will be affected by the change proposed herein. A suitable measuring device must be installed and accurate measurements of water placed to beneficial use must be kept.

This temporary permit does not extend the permittee the right of ingress and egress on public, private or corporate lands.

The issuance of this temporary permit does not waive the requirements that the permit holder obtain other permits from State, Federal and local agencies.

This temporary permit is issued subject to the continuing jurisdiction and regulation by the Orr Ditch Decree Court and the Federal Water Master.

This temporary permit expires one year from the date of issue and shall be exercised as described in either proposed Alternative 3 or 4 as set forth in the Environmental Assessment by the U.S. Department of the Interior dated June 2002, that is the water will be taken in equal amounts over a certain number of months.

The amount of water described under Alternatives 3 and 4 will be delivered at a continuous diversion rate for the percentages described in each month set forth in each alternative.

The point of diversion and place of use are as described on the submitted application to support this permit.

The amount of water to be appropriated shall be limited to the amount which can be applied to beneficial use, and not to exceed 33.02 cubic feet per second or 8292.0 acre-feet as decreed.

Work must be prosecuted with reasonable diligence and proof of completion of work shall be filed on or before:

N/A

Water must be placed to beneficial use and proof of the application of water to beneficial use shall be filed on or before:

N/A

Map in support of proof of beneficial use shall be filed on or before:

N/A

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, TRACY TAYLOR, P.E.,

State Engineer of Nevada, have hereunto set my hand and the seal of my office, this 10th day of June, A.D. 2008

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "T. Taylor, P.E.", is written over a horizontal line. Below the line, the words "State Engineer" are printed.

State Engineer

TEMPORARY

Application No. **77019T**

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CHANGE POINT OF DIVERSION, MANNER
OF USE AND PLACE OF USE OF THE PUBLIC WATERS
OF THE STATE OF NEVADA HERETOFORE APPROPRIATED

THIS SPACE FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

Date of filing in State Engineer's Office MAY 08 2008

Returned to applicant for correction _____

Corrected application filed _____ Map filed FEB 02 2001 under 67182

The applicant See Attachment A

P.O. Box 256 of Nixon
Street Address or P.O. Box City or Town

Nevada 89424, hereby make(s) application for permission to change the
State and Zip Code

☐ Point of diversion

☒ Place of use

☒ Manner of use

☒ of a portion
per letter dated
5/16/08
SMM

of water heretofore appropriated under (Identify existing right by Permit, Certificate, Proof or Claim Nos. If Decreed, give title of Decree and identify right in Decree.)

United States of America v. Orr Ditch Co. in Equity No. A-3, Claim No. 1; in the Federal District Court of Nevada.

1. The source of water is Truckee River
Name of stream, lake, underground, spring or other sources

2. The amount of water to be changed 8,292 acre-feet (2,073 acres @ 4.0 acre-feet per acre).
Second feet, acre-feet. One second foot equals 448.83 gallons per minute.

3. The water to be used for Wildlife, including instream flows for fish (cui-ui and Lahontan cutthroat trout).
Irrigation, power, mining, commercial, etc. If for stock, state number and kind of animals. Must limit to one major use.

4. The water heretofore used for As decreed.
If for stock, state number and kind of animals

5. The water is to be diverted at the following point (Describe as being within a 40-acre subdivision of public survey and by course and distance to a found section corner. If on unsurveyed land, it should be stated.)
As decreed, Section 18, T22N, R24E, M.D.B.&M. (Indian Ditch)

6. The existing point of diversion is located within (If point of diversion is not changed, do not answer.)

81-WA

7. Proposed place of use (Describe by legal subdivisions. If for irrigation, state number of acres to be irrigated.)

Truckee River downstream of Indian Ditch diversion to the Pyramid Lake inlet as shown on the map accompanying Application No. 67182.

8. Existing place of use (Describe by legal subdivisions. If changing place of use and/or manner of use of irrigation permit, describe acreage to be removed from irrigation.)

As decreed on Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation bottom lands.

9. Proposed use will be from As decreed to As decreed of each year.
Month and Day Month and Day

10. Existing use permitted from As decreed to As decreed of each year.
Month and Day Month and Day

11. Description of proposed works. (Under the provision of NRS 535.010 you may be required to submit plans and specifications of your diversion or storage works.) (State manner in which water is to be diverted, i.e. diversion structure, ditches, pipes and flumes or drilled well, pump and motor, etc.)

No new diversion works will be constructed.

12. Estimated cost of works N/A

13. Estimated time required to construct works N/A

If well completed, describe well.

14. Estimated time required to complete the application of water to beneficial use As soon as approved.

15. Provide a detailed description of the proposed project and its water usage (use attachments if necessary):
(Failure to provide a detailed description may cause a delay in processing.)

There will be no diversion. The water is to remain in the Truckee River from Indian Ditch Diversion to Pyramid Lake. The water duty and maximum rate of diversion indicated in the application and its attachments are based on the conditions specified by the State Engineer in Permit No. 71977-T. See Attachment B and attached map which is an April 2008 revision of the map submitted by the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians pursuant to State Engineer Ruling #5185 regarding Application No. 68157-T.

16. Miscellaneous remarks:

This is an application for TEMPORARY change (1 years). see email of 5/30/08
JK

(702) 366-1900

Phone No

E-mail

By Don Springmeyer, Esq. (agent)

Print or type name clearly

Signature of applicant or agent

Robert C. Maddox & Associates

Company Name

3811 W. Charleston Blvd., Suite 110

Street Address or P.O. Box

Las Vegas, Nevada 89102

City, State, Zip Code

**APPLICATION MUST BE SIGNED
BY THE APPLICANT OR AGENT**

\$150 FILING FEE AND SUPPORTING MAP MUST ACCOMPANY APPLICATION

Attachment A

The applicants are:

- 1) **The United States as trustee for the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.**

Allen Anspach, Western Regional Director
Bureau of Indian Affairs
400 N. 5th Street, 14th Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85001 Phone: (602) 379-6600

and

- 2) **The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians.**

John Jackson, Director of Water Resources
Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians
P.O. Box 256
Nixon, Nevada 89424 Phone: (775) 574-1050

Attachment B

This application is filed pursuant to the attached Order dated February 28, 1984, in the case of United States v. Orr Water Ditch Co., Equity No. A-3, in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada and in the interest of comity among the United States, the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe of Indians and the State of Nevada. The applicants specifically reserve all of their rights, interests and authorities pertaining to this matter including, without limitation, all rights and authorities asserted in arguments previously made to the Orr Ditch Court in connection with the above referenced February 28, 1984 Order and the rights to contest the jurisdiction of the Nevada State Engineer and to seek de novo review in the Orr Ditch Court of any orders, decisions, rulings or other actions of the Nevada State Engineer.

The water to be transferred will be used during the irrigation season, through November 15, subject to the condition that no more than 25 percent of the total water right amount will be used in any month. In addition, no more than 37.42 cfs will be used at any time.

This application is for a temporary change pursuant to NRS 533.345, as amended.

The right sought under this temporary change application voluntarily will be exercised in conjunction with other Tribal water rights used for wildlife purposes so as to avoid limitations on diversions of Truckee Meadows water rights pursuant to Article VII (B) of the Truckee River Agreement.

ENTERED

FEB 28 1984

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA
Brenda Gerbst DEPUTYRECEIVED
AND FILED

FEB 28 10 38 AM '84

CAROL C. FITZGERALD
CLERK
BY Brenda Gerbst
DEPUTYIN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

and

PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE OF
INDIANS,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v.

ORR WATER DITCH COMPANY,
et. al.,

Defendants.

In Equity No. A-3-2-WEC

FINAL ORDER GRANTING
THE STATE OF NEVADA'S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT ON THE ISSUE
OF THE UNITED STATES'
APPLICATION FOR CHANGE
IN USE AND CHANGE OF
PURPOSE

The State of Nevada asks this Court to dismiss the United States' Petition for A Change in Place and Purpose of Use filed on April 2, 1979. The State asks this Court to dismiss the petition without prejudice. This would allow the United States to refile its Petition after a showing that the petitioners have applied for said change and received an unfavorable ruling from the Nevada State Engineer. The United States seeks permission to use the unused portion of the water rights on the Pyramid Lake Paiute Reservation, initially awarded for agricultural purposed, for the fishery purposes. The Pyramid Lake fishery currently has an acute need

1 of additional water for both the endangered Cui-Ui and the
2 threatened Lahontan Cutthroat trout. Carson-Truckee Water
3 Conservancy District v. Watt, 549 F.Supp. 704, 706-708, 710-711
4 (D. Nev. 1982). These fishery purposes are consistent with the
5 recent U.S. Supreme Court ruling in Nevada v. United States,
6 U.S. _____, 103 S.Ct. 2906 (1983), per Justice Brennan's con-
7 curring opinion.

8 The decision in United States v. Orr Ditch Water Company,
9 In Equity, D. No. A-3 (D. Nev. 1944), is binding on all parties
10 and is controlling. Nevada v. United States, supra. The
11 September 8, 1944 Decree, at p. 88, provides:

12 Persons whose rights are adjudicated hereby,
13 their successors or assigns, shall be entitled
14 to change, in the manner provided by law the
15 point of diversion and the place, means, manner
16 or purpose of use of the waters to which they
17 are so entitled or of any part thereof, so far
18 as they may do so without injury to the rights
19 of other persons whose rights are fixed by
20 this decree. (Emphasis added).

21 This Court interprets "...in the manner provided by law..."
22 to mean in accordance with Nevada state procedure for allowing
23 changes.

24 The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe (Tribe) and the United States
25 oppose the Motion to Dismiss. They note that, historically, they
26 have attempted to avoid review of their applications by the State
Engineer. That is the reason for their history of invoking this
Court's jurisdiction. The United States and Tribe argue that
the State of Nevada has consistently, in other cases,
opposed the provision of additional water for the Pyramid Lake

1 fishery. Further, they assert that it is unreasonable to expect
2 a state official (here, the State Engineer) to differ from the
3 state's posture of opposing water for the fishery.

4 They also note that considering the application for fishery
5 water in the state administrative system would be inconsistent
6 with Cappaert v. United States, 426 U.S. 128, 96 S.Ct. 2062
7 (1976). In Cappaert, the Supreme Court held that federal
8 water rights are not dependent upon state law or state proce-
9 dures. Caeppert, however, is distinguishable from the present
10 case. In this case, there is no claim that the United States
11 must establish a reserved right under Nevada law (State's Reply
12 to Memoranda in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss, p. 6). The
13 existing establishment of the reserved right, in this case,
14 distinguishes this case from Caeppert.

15 In an attempt to apply state procedural requirements (e.g.,
16 requiring that an application for change in use be presented to
17 the State Engineer), Nevada looks to Arizona v. San Carlos
18 Apache Tribe, ___ U.S. ___, 103 S.Ct. 3201 (1983). In San
19 Carlos Apache Tribe, the Supreme Court interpreted the McCarran
20 Amendment, 43 U.S.C. §666, to allow and encourage state courts
21 to undertake the task of quantifying Indian water rights in the
22 course of comprehensive water adjudications. While a determina-
23 tion made by the Nevada State Engineer is not identical to a
24 decision by a state court, the Supreme Court's theme of
25 "cooperative federalism" will be accomplished by requiring an
26 initial State Engineer determination of water rights.

1 The United States and the Tribe attempt to distinguish away
2 the San Carlos Apache Tribe decision as being applicable only to
3 general stream adjudications. Since presenting an application
4 to the State Engineer would not be part of a general stream
5 adjudication, they argue that San Carlos Apache Tribe is
6 inapplicable. They assert that the better use of the State
7 Engineer's expertise would be to allow the State Engineer to
8 testify in an evidentiary capacity.

9 Contrary to the United States' and Tribe's position, is the
10 trend of "cooperative federalism" as outlined in Nevada v.
11 United States, supra, and United States v. Alpine Land &
12 Reservoir Co., 697 F.2d 851 (9th Cir. 1983). In Alpine, the
13 Ninth Circuit addressed the United States' concern that federal
14 interests will be ignored by the Nevada State Engineer. The
15 appellate court stated, "We agree with the district judge that
16 the notice and protest procedures of Nevada law are adequate to
17 allow exploration of these issues, when they arise, before the
18 state engineer." 697 F.2d at 858. While the subject of Alpine
19 is different than in the present case, the confidence placed in
20 the Nevada procedural law is applicable.

21 As are outlined in the affidavit of Nevada State Engineer,
22 Peter G. Morros, there are practical justifications for requir-
23 ing that applications be made to the State Engineer. These
24 reasons are uncontradicted. The state has presented these
25 uncontradicted facts which would entitle it to a judgment as a
26 matter of law. The United States and Tribe have failed to

1 overcome this factual obstacle. Avila v. Travelers Insurance
2 Co., 651 F.2d 658 (9th Cir. 1981); British Airways Board v.
3 The Boeing Co., 585 F.2d 946 (9th Cir. 1978); Jones v.
4 Halekulani Hotel, Inc., 557 F.2d 1308 (9th Cir. 1977); Soto v.
5 City of Sacramento, 567 F.Supp. 662, 668-669 (E.D. Calif. 1983).

6 First, in all two hundred eighty-four (284) changes of use
7 and purpose, each change was initiated by presentation to the
8 State Engineer. Further, the United States has (in the past)
9 utilized the State Engineer review process (Morros affidavit, p.
10 3).

11 Second, the State Engineer has the manpower, staff, and
12 expertise to make a determination of the beneficial use. Further,
13 he is experienced at addressing claims for fishery uses (Morros
14 affidavit, p. 3). This Court has no more resources than did
15 U.S. District Judge Frank Norcross in 1940. In Judge Norcross'
16 Memorandum Decision and Order, in United States v. Orr Water
17 Ditch Co., et. al., In Equity A-3 (June 26, 1940), he, too, defers
18 to the requirement that the Raffetto application be made first
19 to the Nevada State Engineer.

20 Third, Nevada law has established notice procedures and
21 other procedures that facilitate an efficient administration of
22 applications for change in use and purpose. One such policy
23 provides for notification of change applications to the Federal
24 District Court Water Master (Morros affidavit, p. 3). Further,
25 Nevada state law, Nevada Revised Statute (N.R.S.) 533.030(2),
26 allows characterization of fishery water needs as a beneficial

1 use of water rather than a waste of water.


2 Fourth, requiring the State Engineer's action on all appli-
3 cations for change in use (including the United States' and
4 Tribes' petition) would ensure a uniform treatment of all
5 applications made. The Supreme Court recognized the need for
6 the uniformity of use of the Truckee River. Nevada v. United
7 States, supra, 103 S.Ct. at 292-293.

8 The nature of this case requires examination of the ori-
9 ginal Orr Water Ditch case, Judge Norcross' 1940 Memorandum
10 Order, and the affidavit of Nevada State Engineer Peter Morros.
11 A Federal Rule of Civil Procedure, Rule 12 Motion to Dismiss is
12 a judgment on the pleadings alone. Federal Rule 12(c), however,
13 allows this Court to characterize Nevada's Motion to Dismiss as
14 a Motion for Summary Judgment. The United States and Tribe have
15 been allowed to supplement their pleadings and argue this case
16 pursuant to the prescriptions of Federal Rules of Civil Pro-
17 cedure 12(c) and Local Rule 16(g); Local Rules of the District
18 of Nevada.

19 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that summary judgment is granted
20 the State of Nevada on the issue of presentation of the United
21 States' Application for Change in Use and Change of Purpose.
22 FRCivP 56. The petition must be presented to the Nevada State
23 Engineer for his review and action. The State is ordered to
24 submit a concise Proposed Finding of Fact, Conclusion of Law,
25 and Judgment consistent with this ruling. Local Rule 16(f),
26 Local Rules of the District of Nevada.

1 As in United States v. Walker River Irrigation District, In
2 Equity C-125, this Court reserves jurisdiction to consider change
3 applications. By the State's own consent (Reply in Support of
4 Nevada's Motion to Dismiss Petition by the United States for
5 Change in Place and Purpose of Use, pp. 9-10), this Court retains
6 jurisdiction to entertain an appeal from the decision of the State
7 Engineer and to conduct a de novo review, if necessary.

8 DATED at Reno, Nevada, this 31st day of February, 1984.

9
10 
11 Walter E. Craig
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26